COMMITTEE KICK-OFF

June 13, 2018
STRENGTHENING NEIGHBORHOODS

Welcome
Research indicates that high-quality, integrated schools offer both improved educational outcomes for our children and serve a vital role in promoting and sustaining vibrant neighborhoods. Our committee’s mission is to develop recommendations to increase integration and inclusion in all of our schools and to effectively address issues associated with the declining number of school-aged children in impacted areas of the city.
MEETING OBJECTIVES

• **Begin** building sense of committee.

• **Understand** role of committee and timeline.

• **Gather** committee feedback to develop a common quantitative definition of integration in DPS.
ROLE OF STEERING COMMITTEE

• **ADVISE**: Provide guidance to the district on Strengthening Neighborhoods implementation questions.

• **CONNECT**: Serve as advocates and ambassadors for the Strengthening Neighborhoods work in local communities and collaborating organizations

• **REPORT**: Provide annual reports to the Board of Education on the status of integration and inclusion in the district and the overall implementation of SN recommendations
At your tables, please share:

- Name
- Connection to DPS (e.g., alum, family member at school, work with DPS students)
- What have been your experiences with school integration?
## DRAFT FUTURE COMMITTEE TOPICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Potential Topics for Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Today</td>
<td>1. Committee mission, vision and role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. FEEDBACK on integration definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August/September</td>
<td>1. Further discussion on integration definition as needed and discussion of next steps and engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. UPDATE and discussion on recommendation implementation planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>1. UPDATE AND FEEDBACK on next steps with Equity measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. DISCUSSION: Findings from Strengthening Neighborhoods community focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>TBD flex meeting if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>1. UPDATE and discussion: Strategic Regional Analysis – implications on latest enrollment forecasts for SN recommendation planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. FEEDBACK: Draft integration report to the Board of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** We will gather feedback on your schedule availability in today’s exit ticket in order to schedule future meetings.
MEETING OBJECTIVES

• **Begin** building sense of committee.

• **Understand** role of committee and timeline.

• **Gather** committee feedback to develop recommendation on definition of integration in DPS.
The most common error when we talk about school diversity…

…IS TO ACT AS IF

“DESEGREGATION” AND “INTEGRATION”

ARE THE SAME THING
“Desegregation is eliminative and negative, for it simply removes these legal and social prohibitions [of segregation]. Integration is creative, and is therefore more profound and far-reaching than desegregation. Integration is the positive acceptance of desegregation and the welcome participation of Negroes in the total range of human activities. Integration is genuine intergroup, interpersonal doing.”

- Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in “Ethical Demands for Integration”
DENVER’S HISTORY WITH INTEGRATION (1 OF 2)

1950’s

1954: Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka. The Supreme Court unanimously agrees that segregated schools are “inherently unequal” and must be abolished.

1960’s

1964: Rachel Noel is elected and becomes the first African-American member of the DPS school board.

1967: Superintendent Robert Gilberts creates a plan to desegregate some schools. He is fired in 1969 after a school board election and his successor rolls back the plan.

1970’s

1969: Keyes vs. School District No. 1 – DPS is found to have deliberately segregated schools in Park Hill and ordered to desegregate. US Supreme Court upholds ruling in 1974 and expands district-wide.

1970: Bombs destroy or damage 42 school buses. In 1973, a bomb explodes outside a DPS office building.

1980’s

1969: The Noel Resolution to integrate DPS schools is passed by the DPS Board. Six months later, following a school board election, the plan for desegregation is rescinded.

1980: Congress of Hispanic Educators sues DPS for unequal treatment of English Language Learners. The district is mandated to follow a court order for equal education.

Source: National Equity Project
DENVER’S HISTORY WITH INTEGRATION (2 OF 2)

1990: Evie Dennis becomes first African American and first female superintendent of DPS

2011: DPS adopts a single application for admission into all schools, district-run, innovation and charter schools

2010: DPS adopts the first regional enrollment zones, guaranteeing students a placement in a school in that zone

1995: DPS court ordered busing is ended

1990’s | 2000’s | 2010’s

How do you see Denver’s legacy still impacting education today?

Source: National Equity Project
CHARACTERISTICS OF A HIGH-QUALITY, INTEGRATED SCHOOL

High-quality, integrated schools as defined in the Phase I recommendations:

- Reflect the *equitable involvement* of families, students and the community.
- *Drive district-level and school-level improvements.*
- Benefit all students in multiple ways, *including but not limited to academic outcomes.*
- Are characterized by *classroom diversity, student diversity, teacher diversity and diversity of pedagogy.*
The Committee recommends that DPS establish a **quantitative target** for **increasing socioeconomic integration** within our schools.

Attaining this goal needs to be based on the **socioeconomic diversity of the school’s student body**, as well as **tangible measures of equity and inclusiveness** for all students enrolled.

It is not enough to have students attend school together; **integration requires a school environment where all students feel welcome, safe and valued**.
DEVELOPING AN INTEGRATION GOAL
Process For Gathering Committee Input

Today: Discussion and Reflection
Developing a common definition of integration in DPS

• In order to agree on a common definition, what shared commitments do we need to agree to around how we achieve our target?
• What is the quantitative range for socioeconomic diversity that defines an integrated school in DPS?

Next Meeting: Action Planning
Revisit Phase I recommendations in light of shared definition

• What strategies can we leverage based on the phase 1 recommendations to achieve our target? Where do we need to flex?
• What are short term and long term priorities?

Board of Education:
Bring committee discussion and feedback on definition to the Board for feedback in the fall
SHARED COMMITMENTS

In order to agree on a common integration definition, what shared commitments do we need to agree to around *how* we approach integration?

**TABLE DISCUSSION:**
- Which of these commitments do you agree with? Which do you disagree with?
- What commitments are missing, if any?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Commitments</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reflect a Students First mindset.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Not disproportionately impact one group of students over another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Be grounded in lessons learned from our history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leverage community expertise, existing data, academic research, and the experience of other comparable districts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Balance the benefits of integration with the importance of parental choice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Increase equitable access to high-quality integrated schools for parents and students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Show evidence of equitable and meaningful community involvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Directions:** In the space provided below, please include any shared commitments you feel are missing from the list above.
DPS’ approach to integration should:

1. Reflect a students first mindset.
2. Not disproportionately impact one group of students over another.
3. Be grounded in lessons learned from our history.
4. Leverage community expertise, existing data, academic research and the experience of other comparable districts.
5. Balance the benefits of integration with the importance of parental choice.
6. Increase equitable access to high-quality integrated schools for parents and students.
7. Show evidence of equitable and meaningful community involvement.
DEFINITIONS OF INTEGRATION
How Have Other Organizations Defined Integration?

Integration Goals of Several US School Districts (FRL)

Federal Govt
25%-75% FRL

Stamford*
42%-62% FRL

Champaign
43%-73% FRL

New York City
10%-90% FRL

Dallas

No specific goal identified, rather trying to create additional proof points through the magnet model

*Stamford’s goal takes into account both Free and Reduced Lunch as well as English Language learners and students living in income-restricted housing
WHERE ARE WE AS A DISTRICT?
There are relatively few students served in schools near the district average FRL of 67%.
BENEFITS OF INTEGRATION
What else do we know about where DPS students might be seeing the benefits of integration?

To respond to the committee’s recommendations, the district evaluated the range of local data based on school poverty levels. This includes:

a. Student status and growth on state assessments
b. Whole child measures such as social-emotional intelligence, attendance and discipline
c. College enrollment

NOTE: DPS does not have local data related to many of the commonly cited integration benefits including:

a. Deeper creativity and critical thinking
b. Skills to succeed while living and working in a global economy
c. Reduced bias and prejudice
KEY FINDINGS – PROFICIENCY STATUS

Both non-FRL and FRL students seem to benefit from lower school FRL levels; regarding the percent of proficient students, the effects for non-FRL and FRL students seem about linear. However, our largest academic gaps are at our lowest FRL schools.

CMAS Math 2015, 2016, 2017: % of Students Meeting Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School FRL Range</th>
<th>Non FRL</th>
<th>FRL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[0%-25%]</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25%-50%]</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50%-75%]</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75%-90%]</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[90%-100%]</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY FINDINGS - GROWTH

Both non-FRL and FRL students seem to benefit from lower FRL levels; regarding the percent of students growing below their Colorado peers (SGP below 50), there is also a linear effect that is larger at the extremes (low and high FRL) and flatter in the middle.
Charge:
Develop 1-2 recommendations for a quantitative definition of integration in DPS. For each proposed definition, identify the student impact including benefits and challenges.

Process:
Split into 3 groups to develop recommendations based on lettering on your name tags
• Spend 10 minutes in groups of 3-4 discuss potential definitions and the impact of attending a school as defined
• Reconvene as a group and share out. Identify whether there is commonality and opportunity for consensus or whether the group wants to fully flesh out two definitions.
• Fully build out proposal(s) to share with the full committee (15 minutes)
Split into 3 groups to develop recommendations based on lettering on your name tags.
SHARE OUT
Setting a Definition of Integrated Schools

2 minutes per group

While groups are presenting, consider the following:

- Where do we as a committee have agreement?
- Where are areas where we need further discussion?
Thank you for your meaningful engagement!

Please fill out an exit ticket indicating:

- Meeting feedback
- Your availability for future meetings
- Your interest in co-chairing the committee
- Review and feedback on committee norms